

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,188,982 to Chiang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,342 to Erell, et al. In response, the rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites:

extracting means for extracting the pattern of said input data as the feature distribution;...

generating means for generating said model that corresponds to such a state that said data do not exist, on the basis of the noise that has been input at the time just preceding the inputting of said data, and for updating that which is corresponding to it and is stored in said storing means.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states “Chiang does not disclose extracting noise from input just preceding the input of speech data.” The Examiner then suggests that, because Erell does allegedly contain such a teaching, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to combine the teachings of Chiang and Erell. It is respectfully submitted that such a combination would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art.

Chiang expressly teaches away from the suggested combination. Col. 4, Ins. 2-5. of Chiang state that “[t]he advantages of this on-line PMC method over the conventional PMC method lies mainly in its avoidance of the need to collect the background noise in advance.”

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that because Chiang specifically teaches away from the combination applied by the Examiner, such a combination cannot be the basis of a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn. For similar reasons, the rejection of claims 6 and 7 should also be withdrawn. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is the bases for a contrary view.

The Examiner has apparently made of record, but not applied, several documents. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's implicit finding that these documents, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800